

bill; but I cannot give the Senator any assurances on the subject until we find out the status of the Lillienthal matter next week.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] be excused from attendance on the Senate during the sessions next week, in order that we may attend an international conference overseas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted yesterday it is provided that in the event the motion, which is the motion just had, be rejected, the Senate immediately thereafter recess. I am not sure whether that means that the Senate is in automatic recess at the moment, or whether it is appropriate that I make a motion to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's understanding is that anything can be done in the Senate by unanimous consent, and unanimous consent is being obtained for all that is now transpiring.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to propound a question to the majority leader concerning the probability of a vote being taken on Monday on any measure that may come before the Senate, or on the nominations now pending to the Atomic Energy Commission. I know that a number of Members of this body contemplate going away over the week end, and some of them perhaps cannot return before Tuesday. I should like, if possible, to have an announcement made and an understanding with respect to what is proposed to be done on Monday.

Mr. WHITE. On Monday we will proceed with the consideration of the unfinished business. Whether a vote will be reached during Monday afternoon I cannot say. I shall be perfectly willing myself, if that should be agreeable to the Senator in charge of the matter, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], now to agree not to vote on Monday, but to vote on Tuesday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is agreeable to me, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on the basis of what has just been said to me, I will give such assurance as I can that there will be no binding vote on Monday.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand that statement, it does not mean that there will be a vote on Tuesday; only that there will not be a vote on Monday.

Mr. WHITE. That is all we can do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I am being bombarded before and aft. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Maine. I am simply trying to listen in, and in doing so I came a little closer so I could hear the discussion. I have nothing to contribute to it, but I thank the Senator from Maine just the same. I know that the chairman of the committee has something he would like to say.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to be laboring under any misapprehension. When I said that the suggestion was agreeable to me, it was my impression that the question was, if we did not vote on Monday, would we agree to vote on Tuesday. I am fairly agreeable to that kind of an agreement. I wonder if it is propitious at this moment to suggest the question of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, at a given hour, on the question of the confirmation of Mr. Lillienthal.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa to propound such a unanimous-consent request if he desires to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not have a specific unanimous-consent request prepared, but I will toss a request out for such suggestions as may be made and such action as the Senate may desire to take.

I request unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday next on the question of the confirmation of Mr. Lillienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter, in the order in which their names appear upon the Executive Calendar, to vote upon the other appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter to vote upon the name of the appointee to be General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, the voting, after it begins, to be continued without further debate upon the successive nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Iowa. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator include any request with respect to control of time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before anything further is done, let me say that we had an agreement that nothing of that sort was to be done this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Tennessee is quite right, and I shall not insist upon the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it had better go over until Monday. I may be perfectly willing to enter into such an agreement on Monday, but I do not want to do so this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to assure the Senator from Tennessee that I had no intention a moment ago, nor do I have any intention now, in any way to violate the spirit or the letter of the

unanimous-consent agreement we previously entered into, and, therefore, I withdraw the request.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator had no purpose of violating the spirit or letter of the unanimous-consent request.

#### RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Whether it is necessary to do so now or not, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fr. Lorenzo D'Agostino, the Society of St. Edmund, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thy youngest nation has come of age, and is being asked to become the father of Thy world, to take the lead, to care for and protect Thy indigent children. These legislators are being called upon to make decisions which will influence the lives of Thy children throughout the world. Thou hast stated that all nations will be gathered one day before Thee. May these legislators hear from Thee on that day.

"Come, blessed of my Father, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison and you came to me. Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me"—Matthew xxv: 34-41.

Lord, on the eve of the commemoration of Thy crucifixion, give us the courage to shoulder our responsibilities, no matter what they may be, so that when we shall meet Thee face to face we shall have reason to rejoice. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St.

GEORGE may today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a series of three letters indicating the type of activities the bureaucrats are undertaking to continue themselves in office.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include some editorial excerpts.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two statements, one concerning General MacArthur and the other concerning bureaucracy.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

#### GI TEACHERS FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the April 1947 issue of the Reader's Digest, which is entitled "GI Teachers for German Children." I want to commend Gen. Joseph T. McNarney for a forward step. The best way to combat communism, racial prejudice, and the other substitutes for true Americanism is through education. I am seriously considering making an extended speech suggesting that an educational program should accompany any assistance which we give in connection with loans, military assistance, or any other aid. Unless we establish some such policy, communism will move in when we move out.

#### GI TEACHERS FOR GERMAN CHILDREN

(By Frederic Sondern, Jr.)

(Condensed from the Kiwanis magazine)

For 2 years now our military occupation authorities in Germany have been trying to find a formula for the reeducation of Adolf Hitler's former subjects. Psychologists, teachers, and other specialists have analyzed the postwar German mind. German schools have been purged of Nazi teachers. Teenagers have been forbidden to march, drill, or do anything militaristic. Radio, newspaper, and lecture barrages have been aimed at the older Germans to prove the falseness of the Fuhrer's ideas.

But most of these efforts have made only a slight impression on a hungry and despondent people. The most promising campaign yet launched to affect the German mind of the future has been the invention and doing of the young GI himself.

In bomb-torn Bremen, where juvenile crime and underground Nazi activity were rife last spring, an engaging Minnesota Irishman, Master Sgt. Patrick Moriarty, collected nine of his GI friends. If they wanted to avoid sending their sons to Europe to fight another war, said Moriarty, they would have to do something about these German kids, who, if left to their own devices, would certainly grow up spoiling for it.

The sergeant and his friends decided to start a club for boys from 10 to 17. They found modest quarters, scrounged some furniture, and put an ad in the local paper. To their amazement, 7,000 youngsters responded. Moriarty and his helpers selected the hundred who answered their questionnaires most frankly and intelligently. They came from all levels of German society. The success of the Bremen Boys' Club was immediate and important.

Moriarty made certain ironclad rules. No politics except club politics were to be discussed. Such questions as German war guilt, racial discrimination and the concentration camps were taboo. The young German should think and talk about the future, not the past.

When Moriarty takes his daily walk in Bremen he is usually surrounded by club members, who hang on his words as he discusses everything from the United States legislature to boxing and sportsmanship. His propaganda is naive, and the more effective for its sincerity.

Typical of Moriarty's teachings are the posters, drawn by the boys themselves, which satirize the Rider—the person who bows with servility to his superior and kicks his subordinate. Other caricatures ridicule the lazy Hans, who begs, picks up cigarette butts on the street, and steals food scraps. Scavenging, which is so common and demoralizing in Germany today, took a sharp drop among Moriarty's boys.

The club members proved highly receptive to sound political ideas, too. They were fascinated when told to elect their own governing committee by secret ballot, were even more delighted when informed that they could remove the committee if it became unpopular. These were new ideas and they made a deep impression on the children.

Moriarty and his assistants kept the club's larder freshened with post-exchange supplies, and provided athletic equipment and coaches for the boys. But once the club was under way, the sergeant insisted that the boys run it themselves. They get advice and help from him only when they ask for it. He wants them to be able to carry on after the GI's have gone home, when it will be even more important than it is now.

The influence of Moriarty's idea on Bremen's youth was quickly apparent. The sergeant was summoned before military government officers to tell them how he did it. Get under the kids' skins with something they like, the sergeant explained, and you can teach them anything. In other parts of the American zone, other men like Moriarty were finding this to be true. And word gradually filtered up to headquarters.

By spring of last year it was obvious to Gen. Joseph T. McNarney's staff in Frankfurt that something radical would have to be done about German youth. The Army's Counter Intelligence Corps was particularly worried by the rapid growth of the notorious Edelweiss Piraten and other illegal organizations patterned on the Hitler Youth. Led by former Hitler Jugend fanatics, these foot-loose children chalked slogans on walls, raided military depots for weapons, attacked American soldiers on dark streets. A dangerous nucleus of a future Nazi Party was unquestionably taking shape.

Even among youth groups supervised by military government the old German military traits were cropping up again—the military formation, the rigid standing at atten-

tion, the harsh command, and the importance of beating the other fellow.

General McNarney, with this bleak picture before him, decided that our GI's would have to be mobilized in a concerted effort to change the young German's thinking. The example of Sergeant Moriarty and the others pointed the way. "The average GI is a natural Pled Piper," said one military government officer. "With enough Pled Pipers at work we should accomplish something." The Army's German youth activities program was born.

The Army as a whole was far from delighted. Under a youth-activities officer the GI's were to organize the youngsters of their areas, teach them baseball and football, put on contests, take them on hikes, and hold discussion groups. "So now they want me to be a scoutmaster, too," one irrigated colonel complained to me. The GI's also had misgivings about giving up any of their spare time. But despite the resistance, the program gathered momentum rapidly.

I went to look at some of the results. The tall young trooper from the United States Constabulary Regiment grinned as he looked around the athletic field swarming with German youngsters and GI's. "How do you like our children's party?" he asked me. "There's about 8,000 kids here already, and more coming. They look like they're having a good time."

It was hard for me to believe I was in Germany. In one corner of the huge former Nazi parade ground a noisy softball game was in progress. The Vaihingen "Dodgers" and the Möhringen "Sluggers"—ranging from 8 to 15 in age—were battling erratically but with enthusiasm for the regional pennant. There was a fast double play and GI spectators roared their approval. The German kids on the diamond either beamed or beamed in good sandlot fashion.

In another corner of the field boys and girls were being judged for freckles and red hair—a most un-German sort of competition. There were merry-go-rounds, dogdams, and marionette shows. But the most popular attraction was the jeep riding. A GI would load up his jeep to the limit with squealing, laughing children and give them a fast ride around the grounds. Other GI's distributed quantities of milk, doughnuts, and candy bars.

After five violent hours, the children were loaded into trucks to go back to the city. The regiment's Kinderfest had obviously been a success. "I have not heard so much real laughter among the young people of this district for a long time," remarked an elderly German standing next to me. "It is very encouraging. Your soldiers can do much for a healthy Germany if they keep on with this."

I heard a sour note, too, however. "How they can play these filthy American games," an older teen-age lounge, in remnants of a Volksturm uniform, said to a companion. "How they could touch that food, and laugh, in the face of our disgrace." Few of the young people who make up the age group from 17 to 25 join the boys' clubs.

The GYA's organizers quickly discovered that sports, particularly baseball, were by far the best way to get under the skins of both the German children and the GI's. At first the children's parents were suspicious, scenting an insidious propaganda scheme. The youngsters themselves were difficult pupils. "They simply don't know the meaning of teamwork," moaned a corporal, sweating over his nine in a Munich ball park. "Everybody wants to be the pitcher. They make politics over it. As for sportsmanship—if they lose a game, they talk about losing their honor, and make out that the other guys were cheating. But," he sighed, "we try to teach them. They break down if you keep at them long enough."

Quite a few German youngsters told me their reactions. One of them, the 14-year-

old son of a minor Nazi official, summed it up this way: "At first I didn't like the soldiers. I had heard so much bad about them—their cruelty and all. But our school teacher said we had to learn baseball to please the Americans. After all, they were our governors. But then I discovered that they were really friendly. So I tried very hard, and now I'm on our first team. I wish I could go to America. I think you like each other more than we do."

The GYA program spread in everwidening circles. I went to the weekly meeting of a Rhineland sports club held in a bombed-out house which the local GI's had made habitable. They had installed comfortable furniture, a radio-phonograph, ping-pong table and heating equipment. In the club's board room, where a newly acquired track-meet trophy stood in the place of honor formerly occupied by Hitler's portrait, there was first a heated discussion between a group of GI's and the boys in an amazing mixture of German and English about the organization of a neighborhood football league. Then the question of repairing an abandoned mountain hut for their summer headquarters was taken up.

When the formal part of the evening began, a GI who had been a civics teacher in Ohio gave a talk on election practices in the United States. Although he spoke fluent German, it was heavy stuff to follow. But the kids—almost all of them—listened carefully. The questions that followed were eager:

"How does a man get to be a governor?" "Is it true that the Jewish population of the United States is so strong that they elect the President?" "Has the President a Gestapo like Hitler's?"

They kept at him for over an hour. And one by one the soldier kept knocking down misconceptions created by Dr. Goebbels and perpetuated by word of mouth to this day. He was filling the vacuum in which the bewildered, ignorant youth of Germany are floundering. And they were eating it up.

But the high point of the evening, for me, followed. A youngster about 15 years old got up to talk about "what he had learned from the Americans." He delivered his lecture in typical grade-school-composition fashion. When Germans get together to discuss something, he said in effect, each one tries to force his opinion down the others' throats. The best thing he had learned from the Americans, he thought, was the ability to meet with other people, listen to their views, then come to an amicable agreement. He was very earnest about it, and when he sat down he got resounding applause.

Our military police and CIC reports indicate that both juvenile delinquency and anti-American activity have dropped sharply in those sections of our occupation zone where the GI's have been busy. If the Army's GYA program can be continued and expanded—with sufficient support from the War Department, with athletic equipment, building materials for youth hostels, reading matter and enthusiasm—we have a chance of affecting materially the mentality of many Germans who will strongly influence the key country of Europe 10 or 15 years hence—a time that is likely to be crucial.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House today for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCONNELL (at the request of Mr. TIBBOTT) was given permission to

extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters and tables.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorial comment.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma delegation and a statement on the global alphabet by the Honorable Robert L. Owen, former Senator of Oklahoma.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. ANGELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and in each to include other material.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in an independent paper, the Chicago Times, and also an article appearing in the Washington Post regarding the fact that 2,900 corporations made 28 percent more last year than they ever made before, showing that the country is prosperous.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion.

#### A TEXTILE MILL OWNER'S VIEW ON THE GREEK-TURKISH PROPOSAL

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, a woman who owns and operates a textile mill in a large city told me that although she believes that if a man is hungry we should feed him, and if naked, clothe him, yet the President's proposal about Greece and Turkey is very disturbing. She said first, that Congress has the power to get the facts, and they should be given to the American people. But she wants to know how we can stop communism in any country if the people want it. She says that \$400,000,000 will not do it. Finally, Mr. Speaker, she asked this question: "Would not the best con-

tribution of the United States of America to the world be the rebuilding of her own strength so that she can still remain, as always, the bulwark of free government in the world?"

#### OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, when the Greek question comes to the floor for debate, I sincerely hope that someone will at least attempt to tell this House and the American people what is the foreign policy of this Government.

Frankly, there are so many contradictory statements by persons in authority, so much double talk by administrative spokesmen, that the picture becomes more confused every day.

If the objective of this so-called foreign policy has been peace and security for ourselves and peace and security for peace-loving and industrious nations of the world, then, as of today, it is a 100-percent failure, and no progress to report.

If that policy is to commit this Government to assume every financial burden of all the nations of the world, to supply the armies of the opposing factions striving for power in many of the countries of Europe and Asia, if it is to appease everyone and continue forever the giving away of our money and the products of our labor, if it is to promote confusion and turmoil, then some success can be reported.

Now, 2 years after the war, and the continued flow of billions of dollars in supplies and our meddling in the affairs of most everyone, we find confusion, socialism, communism, guerrilla warfare, and starvation rampant in most of the countries of Europe and Asia. Consequently, we are disturbed by the new venture proposed by the President.

In reviewing the facts surrounding the Greek question, a very confusing and paradoxical situation is presented.

Mr. Constantine Brown, writing for the Washington Star, reports that the guerrilla bands that are now harassing the Greek Government are well equipped and are mainly supplied through UNRRA and lend-lease from the United States.

A Member told the House a few days ago that Greece has \$220,000,000 in assets in the Bank of England and that this sum is restricted to use within the sterling bloc, or can only be used to purchase goods within the Empire.

An Associated Press item in the paper Sunday stated that Greece had active credits in this Government totaling \$93,700,000, to be used for purchases as soon as goods are available.

Turkey, according to reliable reports, is in good financial condition. She did not enter the war and profited by selling supplies to Germany.

A former Ambassador to Russia in a statement to the United States Weekly, as reported in the Times-Herald this morning, says he is in favor of giving legitimate aid to suffering humanity in

Greece and wherever needed, but make sure that this aid goes to relieve suffering humanity and not to support political aspirations.

All in all, this presents a very ugly and confusing picture.

As I said in the beginning, this House and the American people are entitled to a frank and honest statement of our foreign commitments and objectives. This is almost too much to expect from the State Department.

However, after several days of extensive hearings, it is hoped and believed that the members of our Foreign Affairs Committee will throw some light on a very dark subject.

#### PETITION FROM EIGHTH GUAM CONGRESS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted a communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, which dealt with a statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] in the RECORD of March 31. This statement alleged that the Secretary of the Navy had withheld a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States from the Eighth Guam Congress.

Whoever told my friend from California that the Secretary of the Navy withheld this petition told him that which is not true.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is a member, I have gone into this matter thoroughly. I find that the Secretary of the Navy has never received this petition and therefore has not deliberately withheld the matter from Congress.

The action of my colleague in correcting an injustice done the Secretary of the Navy is commendable and manly. Both the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] and the Secretary of the Navy were apparently victims of unfounded and false information.

#### REPRESENTATIVE ADOLPH J. SABATH

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that tomorrow, April 4, will be the eighty-first anniversary of the birth of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has served continuously in this House longer than any other man in the history of this country. He is now in his forty-first year of continuous service to his country.

The story of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is one which should be an inspiration to every child in the country. Coming from Europe at a very tender age, he has established himself throughout the country as a great force

and factor in the upward march of civilization. He holds the belief that the best way we can bring to full fruition the ideals of the framers of our Constitution is to be liberal and progressive in our thinking, and to endeavor to raise the standard of living, in every respect, of all the people of this Nation.

Many of the Members who have served with the gentleman from Illinois during the 41 years he has been here differ with him in principle, but I know that everyone admires his sincerity of purpose, his courage, the tenacity with which he has pursued the right as he believes it to be, and his attention to duty. I do not know of any man in this House who works more faithfully and consistently than the gentleman from Illinois despite his advanced age of 81 years. I hope that we all will see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] with us for many, many more years. He is an example for other Members of Congress to follow. I wish for him the greatest happiness on tomorrow, his birthday, and many more years of health, cheerfulness, and prosperity. Congratulations to you, the dean of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I extend my felicitations to the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, on his eighty-first birthday, and also on his twenty-first term in the Congress of the United States.

He has indeed had a colorful and fruitful life and merits our heartiest congratulations.

It is interesting to reflect on the fact he was born just 1 year after the Civil War came to an end, and came to the United States at the tender age of 15, when James A. Garfield, onetime chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, was serving as President.

When our distinguished colleague was elected to Congress in 1907, Theodore Roosevelt was in the White House and Uncle Joe Cannon, also of Illinois, was presiding over the destinies of the House of Representatives.

What enriching experiences and associations our good friend from Illinois had in his long and fruitful service in this House.

When he assumed the duties of office in the Sixtieth Congress, there was serving in this body many distinguished men, whose names have been indelibly imprinted upon the pages of American history.

From Alabama there was Tom Heflin, Richard Hobson, and Oscar Underwood.

From California there was Julius Kahn, with whose widow many of us served in a later period.

From Illinois came such stalwarts as James R. Mann, Martin Madden, Joseph Cannon, and others, and the gentleman from Illinois is the only survivor of this illustrious group.

Others who were here at that time were Jim Watson, of Indiana; Gilbert Haugen, the farm leader from Iowa; Ollie James, of Kentucky; and also Swager Sherley.

From Massachusetts there was Frederick Gillette, who later became Secretary of War.

From Michigan there was that great tariff expert, Joseph Fordney.

From the State of Minnesota, there was the father of Lindbergh, the flier, and Volstead, the author of the Volstead Act.

There was John Sharp Williams, from Mississippi, who later moved to the Senate, and Champ Clark, of Missouri, who served as Speaker of the House and was in the forefront as a candidate for the Presidency.

From Nebraska there was Norris. Sulzer and Bourke Cochran and Vreeland, of New York, and Claude Kitchen, of North Carolina, served here in the Sixtieth Congress.

From Ohio there was Nicholas Longworth, who later became Speaker, and Theodore Burton, who later went to the Senate.

From Oregon there was Mr. Hawley.

From Tennessee there was Cordell Hull, who later became Secretary of State.

From Texas there was Albert Burleson, who later became Postmaster General, and John Garner, who became Vice President.

From Virginia there was Carter Glass, one-time Secretary of the Treasury, and from Wyoming there was Frank Mondell, who was Republican leader in this House.

What an illustrious group it was, and since then the gentleman from Illinois has enjoyed the associations of thousands who have served with distinction in this body.

I can think of no richer or more colorful experience than that which he has been privileged to enjoy, and may I express the hope that he will have a long life.

As the Easter season approaches, may I wish for him also that rarest of all gifts—serenity and peace of mind.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the House may be in session this afternoon that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the District of Columbia may sit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Criterion for Rent Control" from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### SHORTAGE OF HOUSING AND COMMERCIAL SPACE IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, Kansas City, Mo., in which the larger portion of my district is located, is recognized as one of the growing and progressive cities of the Midwest, with extraordinary industrial potentialities. It is a strategic

gateway to the rich agricultural areas, natural resources, and unmeasured markets of the West. Its location and productive capacity make it a strong and important factor in the planning of our national economy which, for reasons of security and for other reasons, must shift its center of gravity toward the geographical center of the United States. One by one the few conditions which inhibit the vigorous growth and development of Kansas City are being eliminated, and within a few days a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will consider the removal of an important one, the recurrent danger of flood damage from the Missouri River at that point.

Like other cities, Kansas City is experiencing the critical shortage of housing and commercial space which has grown out of the last great war. I am deeply concerned with the acute and distressing conditions resulting from the housing shortage, but it is a specific situation affecting commercial rental space in the downtown district of Kansas City that I wish to discuss today.

Two facts present a sharp silhouette of the picture.

The first is that the great aircraft engine plant in Kansas City, formerly operated by the Pratt & Whitney Co., owned by the United States and presently maintained, I am informed, at a cost to the Government of more than \$65,000 per month or more than three-quarters of a million dollars per year, contains a half million square feet of office space, of which only 150,000 square feet are occupied. The War Assets Administration is attempting to rent the other 350,000 square feet to private tenants at \$1 or less per square foot per year.

The second fact is that in August of last year, 1946, the United States, through the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, purchased one of Kansas City's largest and finest downtown office buildings—the Fidelity National Bank & Trust Building, 32 stories tall and containing some 234,000 square feet of space—for occupancy by Federal agencies, and is dispossessing its private tenants as rapidly as their leases expire. Most of these private tenants have no idea where other space can be obtained, for the Government's action has resulted in a crisis because of the absence of rentable commercial space.

I might add a third fact. Within the last several days the Veterans' Administration has been negotiating for, and by this time has probably concluded, a lease for a building known as the Corrigan Building, containing some 100,000 square feet of space and now occupied by one of Kansas City's foremost manufacturing concerns, the Donnelly Garment Co. That company is preeminent in its field and, with one of the largest pay rolls in the Kansas City area, is a valuable asset to the community. With sufficient, suitable, privately owned space not available elsewhere in the city, Donnelly Garment Co. is obliged either to leave Kansas City or to take over Government-owned space in the aircraft plant while the Government takes over its space in the Corrigan Building.

It doesn't make sense any way you look at it. How can the Government justify its purchase and occupancy of first-class downtown office space, and its action in ejecting private tenants who have no other space available, when the Government owns and maintains acres of new office space at the edge of town?

The excuse for the purchase of the Fidelity Building was the argument that Federal agencies and employees in the Kansas City area could be consolidated and centralized in the building, with increased efficiency and at reduced cost. But the fact is that of the approximately 8,000 Federal employees not already housed in postoffice and courts buildings, not more than 2,000, or 25 percent can be accommodated in the Fidelity Building. The "consolidation" argument is obviously no justification at all. Moreover, one of the agencies newly moved into the building is the Weather Bureau, which moved out of the Federal Courts Building and not out of commercially leased space.

Let me give you some of the facts concerning the Fidelity Building. It was built in 1931, designed for commercial use. Many of its offices were specially laid out and constructed for particular tenants. Its lower floors are occupied by a bank, and other tenants include insurance agencies, lawyers, real-estate and rental firms, railroad offices, investment houses, engineering firms, advertising agencies, and building-and-loan companies. In its present condition, cut up into many suites and separate offices, it is altogether unsuitable for Government occupancy, which requires large open floor spaces. Major, and probably structural, alterations are required to adapt the building to Government use. It is peculiarly unsuited to Government use because of its height of 32 stories and the inadequacy of its elevators to handle the heavy traffic which characterizes any Government space. It was bought by the Government for \$3,300,000, and its removal from the real-estate tax rolls will cost the State of Missouri, Jackson County, and Kansas City more than \$60,000 per year in tax revenues, while 350,000 square feet of Government-owned, tax-free space at the edge of Kansas City goes vacant and begging.

Some Government agencies have already moved with their employees into the building. Several of my constituents have written me that it is difficult to get into the building at all because the lobby is constantly jammed with coffee drinkers and "coke" sippers. One of them wrote me, rather plaintively, I thought:

The Government clerks arrive at work—hardly any of them have anything to do. They no sooner get in the building than they flock over to Brecklein's or to the cigar counter for "cokes" or coffee. In the middle of the morning and in the middle of the afternoon they have to go somewhere for refreshment and relaxation. The FHA has moved to the Fidelity Building. Prior to its removal I made several visits to the Land Bank Building and saw the office in action. . . .

. . . You cannot imagine more people doing less work. I should say there were 10 men in the office. I never saw one of them busy. I never observed a typist who appeared

to have anything to type. What burns me up is that the taxpayers are being bled to death with this kind of waste. I hope that Congress makes a searching investigation of the bureaus. If the ones in Kansas City are any example, their personnel could be cut at least three-fourths and the service improved thereby.

Mr. Speaker, many others would testify to the same effect. It is unthinkable that the Government should deprive private firms and individuals of their space in a building specially designed for their use and fill it with myriad clerical and ministerial activities which could as well be carried on in the 350,000 square feet of office space which the Government owns at the edge of the city. Yet for that very purpose the Government bought the building and paid for it almost twice its assessed value. One result has been a sharp inflationary increase in rates for the insignificant amount of office space available in the city, for which there is desperate competition among those persons and firms who are being or are to be evicted from the Fidelity Building.

There are many other undesirable consequences which have followed the Government's purchase of the building. The parking problem, always a difficult one in downtown areas, is becoming infinitely more so in the vicinity of the building, as increasing numbers of Government employees, other tenants, and persons doing business both privately and with the Government, seek parking space. The result is confusion and delay.

Consider the 350,000 square feet of vacant office space which the Government owns in the aircraft plant. It is considered suitable for private occupancy and is offered for that purpose by the War Assets Administration, but it is ideal for the use of Government agencies because of the large areas of open office space, unpartitioned. The War Assets Administration is asking \$1 per square foot per year for it, with no takers. That is the space which ought to be occupied by Government agencies. It is true that some Federal agencies need to be in the downtown area. They can be adequately housed, in my opinion, in the thousands of square feet of commercial space which the Government already occupies downtown. There are many departments which can carry on their work with equal or better effect in the space which the Government already owns. They do not need to occupy first-class, expensive office space in the heart of the business district. Certainly, established private businesses ought not to be compelled to leave the city or perhaps be forced out of business in order to make room for them.

Of course, myriad objections are made and will be made to utilization of the Government-owned space by the Government. It is located outside the business district and at the very edge of the city. But it is easily and quickly accessible by automobile; public transportation is nearby, and, in the event of expanded occupancy, would be available to the door; and a large Government-sponsored housing project virtually adjoins it. There is no merit to the argument that

it is inconveniently located for Government use. Some relocating of agencies ought to be made which would leave in space already rented downtown those whose activities involved the greatest public contact. The others should be moved to the Pratt-Whitney plant, with its 350,000 square feet of empty office space, which the Government owns.

Early in my Army service my duties included the leasing of space for use of all War Department agencies. In that work we took over some 10,000,000 square feet of office and storage space in the nine States comprising the Seventh Service Command. Exigencies of the war compelled us to cause some dislocation of private business, some of it in Kansas City. But the war is over. Economy and common sense demand that the Government make the best and most efficient use of what it has—of the enormous facilities it constructed with the taxpayers' money. I know from experience that no Government agency is ever satisfied with the space to which it is assigned, but in this critical period of recovery and readjustment they should be required to get along with what is available.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. REEVES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is happening in Kansas City in connection with the purchase of this large office building is also happening in many of our other cities. I wonder if the gentleman has given any thought to the question whether or not the Government of the United States should compensate Kansas City and other cities for the taxes that they lose by reason of these buildings being taken off the assessment rolls. Further, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the District of Columbia most of the downtown large buildings are owned by the Government and are therefore not subject to taxation, but the Congress for years has recognized the inequality brought about by their removal from the tax rolls and appropriates annually a certain sum of money for the upkeep of the city of Washington. Does the gentleman not believe we are now reaching the point where such consideration should be given to other cities where the Government is purchasing these large buildings and taking them off the tax rolls?

Mr. REEVES. I certainly think the equities of the situation demand that the Government should not be accorded the benefit of all the services provided by local governments and not take care of any of the costs of them. I think what the gentleman has said, and I thank him for what he has stated, emphasizes that point. Where the Government has space, and certainly as much space as it has available in the particular instance to which I have alluded, it should use that space first before undertaking the dislocation of private tenants.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Last year the Veterans' Administration purchased one

of the most valuable buildings in the downtown area of the city of Des Moines, although there were other Government buildings available at the edge of the city that they could have used. It chose to go downtown and purchase a large office building which has now been removed from the assessment rolls and the private owners will be required to pay proportionately higher taxes.

Mr. REEVES. I think the action of the Government in that case is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, conditions in the business area of Kansas City brought about by the Government's purchase of the Fidelity Building are growing rapidly worse, and public resentment is increasing every day. No remedy will alleviate the situation except the return of the Fidelity Building to private ownership and occupancy.

I have today introduced in the House a bill looking to the sale of the building if there is a private buyer for it at its fair market value. The bill is not long and I include it at this point in my remarks:

A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized and directed to cause to be determined by appraisal the fair market value of certain real estate in Kansas City, Mo., recently acquired by the United States, which real estate consists of the building known as the Fidelity National Bank & Trust Building and the tract of land on which said building is situated, said real estate being located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ninth and Walnut Streets in said city. Said fair market value shall be determined and the amount thereof shall be made a matter of public information on or before September 1, 1947. For the purpose of making such determination, the Commissioner shall employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, three disinterested persons, resident in Kansas City, Mo., who have knowledge of the value of real estate in Kansas City and are qualified appraisers of real estate used for industrial or commercial purposes in said city.

Sec. 2. From and after the date upon which such fair market value is determined as herein provided and until December 31, 1947, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall solicit and receive sealed bids for the purchase of said real estate from the United States. Said bids shall not be opened prior to January 1, 1948. On or after January 1, 1948, but in no case later than January 10, 1948, said bids shall be opened and made a matter of public information.

Sec. 3. On or before February 1, 1948, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall transmit to the Congress a report of the action taken pursuant to this act and the results thereof, attached to and making a part of, said report (1) a digest of said appraisal and a statement as to the amount of the fair market value of said real estate as determined thereby, and (2) an abstract of all bids received for the purchase of said real estate, showing as to each bid the name of the bidder or bidders and the amount and terms of the bid. Said report shall serve as the basis for further action by the Congress with respect to the sale of said real estate by the United States.

In order to establish the fair market value of the building and land, provision

is made for a new appraisal, to be made by three qualified and disinterested appraisers of Kansas City, Mo. The result of the appraisal is to be made public not later than September 1, 1947. In order to test the market, it is provided that the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall receive sealed bids for purchase of the building until December 31, 1947. The bids are to be opened, and their amounts and terms made public, not later than January 10, 1948. It is further provided that by February 1, 1948, a report shall be made to the Congress giving the amount of the fair market value as determined by appraisal and the amounts and terms of the bids. If this bill is enacted, which I earnestly urge, and a bid is received which equals or approximates the fair market value, I intend to introduce a bill immediately after February 1, 1948, authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to complete the sale.

Only return of the building to private ownership and private occupancy will relieve the critical space shortage which has brought about the present emergency in Kansas City.

It is my conviction that in acquiring title to the Fidelity Building the Government has once again failed to consider the impact of its action upon existing conditions.

(Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a bill he introduced today.)

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] be granted leave of absence from noon today to and including Tuesday, April 9, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a statement by the legislative representative of a veterans' organization, and in the other a statement by the national commander of the DAV.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### ANTIRACKETEERING LEGISLATION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the whole country has recently been shocked

by the reports of bribery and attempted bribery in the world of sports. A bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to punish such activities. Such a measure has the endorsement of my good friend and constituent Abe J. Greene, of Paterson, N. J., president of the National Boxing Association and a long-term fighter for clean and honest sports. He urges passage of the Hébert bill, about which he has written me as follows:

MARCH 31, 1947.

Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you very much for the copy of the bill introduced by Congressman HÉBERT, of Louisiana, to punish bribery in connection with interstate athletic competition.

I think this measure should be very vigorously pushed, and I hope that it is not sidetracked as unimportant legislation as soon as the momentary hysteria in the athletic world is dispelled. It is very important that there be on the books of the country a measure which will always be available with which to strike hard at the crooks and other vermin who would prostitute sports. America is a nation of hero worshippers and there isn't a kid in the country who at some time or other hasn't adopted some outstanding sports figure as an example in whose footsteps he would hope to follow. Crooks who hold forth the lure of a bribe to the fellows in athletic spotlight do more than merely transgress on decency—they strike a blow at one of the basic influences of American life, and I think Congressman HÉBERT will perform a national public service in seeing his measure through to final enactment.

Please give him my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ABE J. GREENE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### DAIRY PRICES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, few people, I believe, realize that New York State is the greatest producer of fluid milk in this country. New York State is famous for many things, principally the city of New York, but few appreciate that it is one of the greatest agricultural States of the Union. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent two of the greatest dairy counties in the great State of New York, Orange and Delaware. When I was last home I saw two farmers' delegations, one from my home county of Orange and one from Delaware County. Their plight is practically the same. They are the victims of planned economy, and, as we know, plans often miscarry. I should like to take time to explain just how the plans of the Federal Government have miscarried in respect to the dairy farmers of my district.

The Federal Government, in its omniscience, decided that beginning January 1947 there would be a price recession and that, therefore, the price of milk should be reduced. Unfortunately the recession did not occur. The farmers are paying more for all feed, for gasoline, for tractors and farm machinery, and for lubricating oil. These prices are still going up; they are not receding. The price of wheat was \$87 on February 13 and it was \$100 on March 13. Oats were \$72.60 on the same date in February and

\$84 on the same date in March. The increase has occurred on oats, soybean oil, meal, hominy, middlings, and bran.

On March 17 the GLF manager telegraphed into my district that 20 percent dairy ration price would be increased \$2.50 a ton.

It stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer cannot be expected to produce anything for less than he is being paid. I should like to quote from a letter from the Montgomery Producers Cooperative of Orange County under the date line of March 12:

A meeting of protest of all milk producers in southern Orange County was held in the Goshen Courthouse on the evening of March 6, 1947. Representatives of most of the creameries were present, and the city of Middletown is their principal shopping center. The pay checks from 10 creameries have had until now a combined total of approximately \$800,000 each month. Figuring at the daily intake rate of 50,000 pounds of milk at each plant, a 2-cent reduction which we have been forced to accept amounts to about \$5,000 per day for the 10 creameries, or \$150,000 per month that this area is reduced in purchasing power.

It is unfair on the very face of the thing. It costs just as much to produce a quart of milk in February and March as it does in December. When cattle are not stabled, the cost of production is much less, and we are most willing to cooperate at that time.

If there is a surplus now, that increased production was in response to Government needs and its constant urging to produce. The dairyman, having done all that his Government required, should not be compelled now to bear the possible losses sustained in reconversion to a peacetime footing. Do you think labor would take a 20-percent cut in wages now?

The farmers have asked for a price of \$5.02 per hundredweight up to and including the month of June. Economists from our State college say this price represents only costs, and if they are to continue to operate they must have costs.

I called up the Department of Agriculture this morning, and the price for this month per hundredweight in Delaware County is \$4.60 and in Orange County \$4.65, and the cost price is \$5.02 per hundredweight.

The cost of milk is one that the public is willing and able to pay. There is no question of asking for Government subsidies. Most of the farmers I have spoken to do not want any; in fact, they want no Government interference. They would like the Government to admit that the price rescission they fear has not occurred and that they have penalized the farmers by putting the price of milk down to \$4.60 a hundredweight when it costs \$5.02 to cover the cost of production.

I am sure that we want to see agriculture prosper. I know that all fair-minded people will agree that no one did more unselfish work during the war to feed not only our own country but a great part of the civilized world than the American farmer. And, last but not least, Mr. Speaker, the farmer works 365 days a year every year. The farmer never strikes, and without the farmer none of us could live.

The American farmer is not asking for favors. He is only asking for justice. He is not asking for hand-outs.

He is asking for a fair price for his product.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is the all-important question of what the Congress intends to do about strikes which injuriously affect public health, safety, and welfare, which is emphasized at the present time by the threatened industry-wide strike of telephone employees.

Sooner or later Congress must find the right answer. We might just as well come up with it now as later. We all recall that a year or so ago the railroad employees went out on strike and President Truman sent a message to the Congress asking that we pass an act drafting railroad employees, compelling them to work. If my memory is correct, that bill went through this House with but a few dissenting votes and died in the other body. That was drastic action on our part.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe there were 13 votes against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman for the correction. That is an unlucky number, is it not?

The gentlemen who voted against the President's request may have thought the measure was too drastic; was contrary to our principles of government. Those who voted for it undoubtedly believed that the public could not be permitted to suffer through a Nation-wide tie-up of transportation of food.

Then, we had the coal strike. Fortunately for our people, the President and the Supreme Court settled that one, at least, temporarily.

Now, we have this threatened strike in the telephone industry that will inconvenience everyone if it comes as announced. It may perhaps injuriously affect the public health, safety, and welfare. But, regardless of that particular situation, the Congress now and the Committee on Education and Labor has before it the necessity of determining what the public policy shall be when the welfare of the Nation is threatened.

The Committee on Labor has been wrestling with that question for something like 2 months. Just the other day, on April 2, I believe, it reported out a bill—a quickie, they called it. It was my understanding when the bill H. R. 2861 was drafted it would provide that when the President found there was a situation which injuriously affected the public health, safety, and welfare, he would

so declare. Then he was required to order the Attorney General to make application to the court for an injunction and for other court orders which would remedy the situation, get the utility back into operation. That was all right, so far as it went. Then the committee proceeded, after the first two pages of the bill, to write in provisions as to fact-finding, then mediation. Then there was a suggestion that there be what they called voluntary arbitration, if there is any such thing, with the Government on one side of the issue, over a period of 75 days. I wonder what those who know that the supplies of food, water, light, transportation, and communications of a whole city like Washington will be shut off think is going to happen if that should continue for a period of 75 days.

I wonder what they believe as to whether a company can find people to operate the service if you have mediation and conciliation and arbitration, and then when the striking employees agree to a settlement, those who have gone in in the emergency and taken over the job of running the street cars, tending the electric-light plants which furnish the light or pump the water, are to be kicked out as soon as those who are in the union have concluded that they want to go back to work.

There is no use of fooling about this situation. The basic and fundamental issue is this: Does this Congress intend to be intimidated, coerced longer into temporizing with measures which permit groups, and organizations, to impair the welfare of all of the people? You can talk about the right to strike, you can talk about the right to organize, all those things; but in the end the issue is whether the desire of the individual or of a minority must yield to the public good. We know what happens when the safety of our Nation is threatened by a foreign enemy. The Congress enacts a law and the President takes the young man into the Army, sends him wherever they want him to go, to work or to fight as the commanding officer directs. Yet, when the safety and the welfare of our Nation are imperiled by strikes we sit back and say: "No, you cannot stop that."

Well, why not? If these strikes continue, and there have been examples all over the country where the interest of the public has been affected and health and safety impaired, we will have on a large scale just what we have had in some of these instances. As for example, down in Tennessee, where the employees' relatives got together and went down to the picket line and said: "Get out of the way." And they got out of the way.

Some people say you cannot make a man work. All right, concede that point for the sake of the argument, although I deny its validity when the national welfare is involved. But concede it if you wish. What is the answer? If the employees of the telephone company, the railroad company, for instance, or any public utility want to quit, refuse to work, let them quit. In the bill, H. R. 2862, offered on the same day H. R. 2861 was offered, and in the bill H. R. 90, which was offered on the 3d day of January of this year, it was provided that if any man did not want to work he could

quit. Then what happens? The bill provides that the company may and that it shall be its duty to hire someone else. Why? Because you and I must have water to drink, we must have food to eat, we must have light, we must have heat, and all of those things which are necessary if we would live. Yes, and so must the man who quits his job, and so must his wife and his children. When he will not transport food to the city, is it your obligation or mine to feed him, his family? He would be outraged if the groceryman refused to sell to him. But he will not work or aid in replenishing the groceryman's shelves. Then why, I ask, should Congress sit back and because someone wails about the sacred right to strike and says you cannot make a man work—why should we sit here and refuse to pass legislation which everyone must concede is for the benefit of the Nation as a whole?

My thought is this: Keep right on and let these men strike, let them prevent others from working, and sooner or later you will have violence, rioting, you will have civil strife; for while our people are patient and long-suffering, there comes a time when their patience is exhausted, when they are not going to stand for it any longer, then let those who stand between the people and their food or their fuel beware.

It is my hope that if and when the House Committee on Labor gets its bill to the floor for consideration, the membership will strike out some of those provisions about fact-finding, mediation, and conciliation, and think first not of the effect that the act might have upon our political future but of what is necessary to protect the public.

In that bill—H. R. 2861—there is a provision exempting all of those to whom the Railway Labor Act applies. Why, think of it. Is there any reason, is there any reason, I ask, why the railway employees throughout this Nation should be permitted to tie up the transportation system of the Nation and imperil the lives of those in the cities? If you tie up the distribution of food for even a week, the folks in the city will be hungry. That would be true if it were tied up for only a few days.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In my opinion, the gentleman in his thinking, in his utterances, and in his performances is as sound as gold money. He discusses a question that is presented to this Congress and it is one we must meet. It is a question that will test the worthiness of the membership of this body to represent all the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. That issue is coming up; it has been with us for a long time but soon we are going to be forced to stand up and be counted. I repeat, the issue is whether we are going to legislate in the interest and for the benefit of our people as a whole, legislate for the public health, safety or welfare or whether we are going to be frightened because of what might happen to some of us through the voting power of some union or some group of

unions who issue—upon having their way—their special privileges?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot help but think of the tragic consequences of, for instance, tying up our light system or even the telephone system or any of our public utilities. You can hardly pick up a paper that you do not see where there has been some marvelous operation performed on an infant or on an adult. Hundreds of people are under the knife on operating tables every day, particularly in large cities. Just imagine what might happen to a surgeon who was in the midst of operating on a muscle of a heart or perhaps working on some delicate mechanism of the eye if suddenly the lights were to go out. What would be the ghastly consequence of that? Take the telephone strike now impending. We saw in the paper this morning the picture of a couple of babies that were saved because they were able to get the necessary drugs and get them quickly. Suppose there were no telephone facilities by which they could reach the right doctor, the right surgeon, or the right institution in order to save life? It could carry itself to a point where this would be anything but a free country when people are deprived of their life as well as their liberty as the result of a group tying up the country in such a way that it might almost be called murder of the innocent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will recall, in Michigan in 1937, on the eastern side of the State, the CIO threatened to pull the switches through which went the power to hospitals, police stations, and fire departments. At that time the public opinion shut down on them, and said, "No; you don't." But it required a show of threatened force to end that situation. Soon after the 15th of the month the House will get an overall labor bill. Before that date let us do some sound, sober thinking.

#### STRIKES AFFECTING THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan very properly directs our attention to the problem of what we are going to do with strikes involving the public welfare. He very properly calls attention to the proposals he has made and the proposal being reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. In this connection I would like to suggest to the Members that they call for a copy of the bill, H. R. 2900, which I introduced yesterday. This takes portions of H. R. 725, which I introduced in January, and deals with what I call the "end dispute" and proposes a remedy, a method of handling the situation.

The end dispute, in my opinion, is that dispute which you have on your

hands when you have exhausted all of the procedures of collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration. If it is a dispute in an essential or monopolized service or industry which vitally affects the public welfare, the public health, or the public safety, we, as Members of Congress, simply cannot ignore the situation.

Under the Clayton Act and under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the courts have held that the Government is practically powerless. Read the Norris-LaGuardia Act where it says that no court shall have jurisdiction to grant an injunction in questions involving a labor dispute. You will find it difficult, if you are a layman, to quarrel with the contention that was made by John L. Lewis and his attorneys that the courts have been denied the right to grant an injunction, and on that particular point the Supreme Court upheld the Government's position by only a 5-to-4 vote, as I recall.

So it seems to me that this Congress faces the responsibility of saying what we are going to do in these end disputes. The John L. Lewis decision hung upon the seizure of the industry under the Smith-Connally Act, an act which expires the 30th of June. Without Government seizure, the Government is powerless today to handle these end disputes.

The public must be made aware of the difference between the right of an individual to quit work and the right to strike. A distinction must be established between the right to work and not to work, and the right to strike. A distinction must be established in the public thinking between the right to work or the right to quit work, and the right to strike, when you are speaking of public-welfare disputes. The right to strike implies acting in concert; it implies collective action.

Now, the courts have held that under the interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act the courts are powerless to grant injunctions where a private employer is the applicant in any situation involving a labor dispute or labor organization. The courts have held that if a labor organization does something, thinking it is doing it in its own best interest, the court will not intervene. That kind of a concept must be changed. I want to assert that where the public welfare, the public safety, and the public health are involved, there is no natural right for any group of men to conspire, to act in concert, against the general welfare, even in the name of good intentions by labor organizations. And until the Congress writes some law that says that effectively, the public will not be protected.

So I urge, with the gentleman from Michigan, that you give consideration to these bills that have been presented and be ready to act upon them when the opportunity comes before us.

#### THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see an interest manifested in this very vital question of what we are going to do about strikes in public utilities. Really, the time has come when we ought to stop talking about it and do something about it. It is most vital and most dangerous.

Now, the gentleman from South Dakota, who has been so helpful in this matter through the years, called attention to the fact that the so-called Smith-Connally Act expires the 30th of June and that we will not be able to get any aid from that act after that date. I call your attention to the fact that, so far as any future strikes are concerned, the Smith-Connally Act has already expired, because the law provides that there shall be no seizures under the act after the President's declaration of termination of hostilities, so that, if the telephone strike takes place on next Monday, this Government is utterly powerless to do anything about it.

Now, the only reason that the Government is powerless to do anything about it is because of the previous conduct of the Congress in passing the Norris-LaGuardia Act. If it were not for the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it is unquestionably true that the Government would have the right to intervene in these strikes which affect the general welfare of the whole public to go into court and ask for an injunction. As a matter of fact, there are numerous decisions of the courts which hold that the paramount right of the public, the paramount right of the Government to exist and conduct its normal affairs overrides what some people are pleased to call the right to strike. There are plenty of decisions on that subject. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court has held that there is no such thing as an absolute right to strike.

What we have been neglecting to observe over the years in dealing as we have with these labor problems, the vital thing we have neglected to observe, is that the right of the public, the right of the average citizen to pursue his normal course of activities, is paramount to the right of any minority group to say that the Government shall not function any longer "unless we say so."

I have called attention to this situation over the years. I have made numerous speeches on the floor on the subject, in which I pointed out to the Congress that you have a situation existing in this country when one man can, and does, say to this Nation of 140,000,000 people, "You shall not have any coal after tomorrow morning, and therefore the wheels of industry of this whole Nation shall cease to revolve." You have a situation where one man by reason of his influence through the closed shop and other influences which he exerts over the workmen of this country, whether they wish it or not, can stop the production of the steel that is necessary to carry on the economy of this Nation. You have the situation where one man

can stop the wheels from rolling on all the railroads in the country. That condition is not something new today. You are confronted today with a condition where one man is saying to this Nation that the telephone shall not operate after next Monday. That is nothing new. That has been with you ever since all of you have been Members of Congress. It has been called to the attention of this Congress, and I am glad to say that this House has attempted to act on this subject and has been stymied in its action only by failure to act on the part of another body on this Capitol Hill. That does not relieve us of our duty to continue to try to act, to continue to bring to the attention of the other branches of government and to this Nation as a whole the situation in which we are placed by the autocracy of half a dozen men in this Nation who have the power and exert the power month after month and year after year to come forward with their demands and say, "Unless you meet our demands, reasonable or unreasonable, you shall no longer function."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to call attention to the fact developed by the hearings before the Labor Committee that right at the present time, beginning back on January 16 of this year, a man named Abe Goldberg, a gangster, but acting as head of a union, pretending to act as a union official—of course he was not—declared and made good his declaration that the people of Philadelphia should not have produce to eat unless it was handled the way he directed it to be handled and by the men he directed should handle it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are numerous such instances. They are prevalent all over the country. Everybody knows about them. They are happening every day, yet we are not doing anything about them.

Now, on these public utilities, we ought to think about this question. We have this bill coming from the Labor Committee which says that we shall enjoin them and we should enjoin those types of strikes, no question about it, but then it goes on into fact-finding and submitting proposals as to what the utility ought to do about wages. But there is one thing that we must never overlook. A public utility is regulated and controlled by the Government in the matter of its rates. When you put up the rates of pay on a public utility, unless you also at the same time put up the rates of the service to the public you are just heading those utilities into insolvency. But when you come down to talking about arbitration of these wage rates with public utilities, unless you at the

same time can arrange some device by which their rates to the public shall likewise be arbitrated so that they may have a fair return, you are getting into serious trouble.

I do think we ought not to delay very much longer in putting over to the body on the other side of the Capitol some constructive legislation on the whole labor situation, and on the boycotts that are going on and destroying little businesses all over the Nation, and we ought not to delay putting up to the other body the question of what we are going to do about these strikes in essential industries that so vitally affect the economy of the whole Nation.

#### THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot restrain myself. Do you not recall that clarion call of a citizen of Massachusetts, "There is no right to strike against the public safety any time, anywhere"? Do we not realize that the public enthusiastically supported that statement? Can we not now have an anvil chorus of that familiar slogan, "There is no right to strike against the public safety any time, anywhere"? This Massachusetts citizen was afterward elected President of the United States. Why do so many Members of Congress show only a sheep's courage in defense of the safety of the people?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD for March 31 shows that a request was made in my behalf for leave of absence for March 31 and April 1. I did not make that request. The request was not made in my behalf. I was present on both March 31 and April 1. I make this statement for the purpose that the RECORD may so indicate that fact. Apparently the request was made for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWEL].

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

514. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 168 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1362. A bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; with amendments (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1371. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2946. A bill to make retrocession to the State of California of jurisdiction over certain land to be used in connection with operations of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2947. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police Force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2948. A bill to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies acting within the United States or its Territories and dependencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2949. A bill to prohibit certain interferences with interstate commerce in connection with the transportation of property by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2950. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2951. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of \$60 per

month to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2952. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOWEN:

H. R. 2953. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2954. A bill to provide for the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia through the establishment of rating organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 2955. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2956. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 2957. A bill to establish a National Memorial Forest Park in the State of Missouri as a memorial to World War II veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2958. A bill to emancipate the Indians of the United States and to establish certain rights for Indians and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2959. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Treasury Department who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Chauncey C. Ketchum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Meador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

301. Mrs. NORTON presented a petition of James Boulgarides, of Jersey City, N. J., and 23 others, protesting against the President's proposed policy toward Greece and Turkey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.